

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE J		PAGE OF PAGES 1   10	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 23-Jun-2005		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W81D4A-5108-5780		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, CHARLESTON ATTN: CONTRACTING DIVISION 69-A HAGOOD AVENUE CHARLESTON SC 29403-5107		CODE W912HP		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6)  <b>See Item 6</b>		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W912HP-05-R-0007	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 17-Jun-2005	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) The purpose of this modification is to incorporate the Source Selection Plan into the solicitation. This document contains pertinent instructions to offerors on how proposals will be evaluated for award. Each offeror shall review the instructions and submit the necessary information within his/her proposal for evaluation. ALL OFFERORS ARE REQUIRED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THIS AMENDMENT.							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED  24-Jun-2005	

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

## SECTION 00100 - BIDDING SCHEDULE/INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

The following have been added by full text:

**SOURCE SELECTION INSTRUCTIONS****ATTACHMENT 1****I. INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS**

**I. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD.** This acquisition is being procured as a best value with unrestricted competition. Offerors will be evaluated using the below criteria, weighted in descending order of importance.

**A. FACTOR 1: PRICE**

**B. FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE.** Past Performance is approximately equal to cost or price. Offeror shall be evaluated on three relevant projects in the past five (5) years that are either in progress or completed that include design, manufacture of components, shop testing, demolition, installation and field tests for electric hoist, lift gates and trash racks rehabilitation. Relevant projects are those similar in terms of cost, complexity, design or features of this requirement. The Offeror's past performance in completing projects during the last five years will be evaluated to determine technical capability to perform the proposed contract and how well it satisfied its customers. The information presented in the Offeror's submittal, together with that from other sources available to the Government will compose the input for evaluation of this factor. The following elements will be evaluated for each project:

- Safety and Health
- Quality of Construction
- Timeliness of Performance
- Project Management
- Customer Satisfaction

**1. Offeror's Submission Requirements.****a. Project Information Sheets.**

(1) Offeror shall submit, for three relevant projects in the past five (5) years that are either in progress or completed, a Project Information Sheet demonstrating the above elements for this Factor 2, Past Performance.. The Project Information Sheet, one for each of the three projects shall include the following: Project Title; Location; Contract number; Nature of involvement in this project; i.e. General Contractor, subcontractor, designer; Procuring activity; Procurement point of contact and telephone number; List date of construction completion or percent completion if construction is underway; Address of facility/plant; Address and telephone number of owner; Indicate type of project (private sector, Government, planned unit development, etc.); Original contract cost; Total cost of all modifications; Total contract cost; List of all subcontractors who perform(ed) 5% or more of the total value of the contract, including addresses, points of contact and phone numbers; and List of suppliers/subcontractors of Primary Process Equipment including names, addresses, points of contact and phone numbers.

(2) The Offeror shall submit either OSHA form 200 or 300 showing the incident rates for their firm including major subcontractors utilized for all projects within the past five (5) years. Incident rates for the year is Number of Lost Time Accidents for the year x 200,000/Man-Hours Worked that year.

**b. Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaires.** Offeror's shall provide a Questionnaire, one to each Point of Contact (POC) identified on the Project Information Sheet for Factor 2, Past Performance. A Transmittal Cover Letter and Questionnaire are included for your use. Offeror shall complete the Transmittal Cover Letter and forward the Transmittal Cover Letter and Questionnaire to the POC identified in the Project Information Sheet for this Factor 2, Past Performance. When completed, the POC shall mail, fax or e-mail the questionnaire to the Charleston District Contract Specialist identified in the Transmittal Cover Letter provided. It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure that the reference documentation is provided, as the Government may not make additional requests for past performance information from the references. The completed Questionnaire shall be provided to the Charleston District Contract Specialist directly from the reference. Questionnaires shall demonstrate the above elements for this Factor 2, Past Performance, and shall be for three relevant projects in the past 5 years that are either in progress or completed.

**c. Other Sources.** The Government may contact sources other than those provided by the Offeror for information with respect to past performance. These other sources may include but are not limited to CCASS (Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System), telephone interviews with organizations familiar with the Offeror's performance, and Government personnel with personal knowledge of the Offeror's performance capability.

**2. Evaluation.** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance using the sources available to it including but not limited to: the example projects identified by the Offeror, Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaires received, and CCASS. Offerors shall be provided an opportunity to address any negative past performance information about which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. The Government treats an Offeror's lack of past performance as an unknown risk. The Government will evaluate past performance based on the elements listed below:

**a. Safety and Health.** The Government will evaluate all information provided by the offerors to include the offeror's past safety record and a list of all incident rates, including loss of equipment in excess of \$5,000.00 and serious accidents when defined as permanent disability or loss of life.

**b. Quality of Construction.** Based on information provided in the questionnaire and other information, the Government will assess the quality of the actual construction undertaken and the standards of workmanship exhibited by the Offeror's team. Provide documentation, which demonstrates that the Quality Control personnel that will be assigned to this job have knowledge and experience in QC procedures and processes specifically with hoist, gate lift, and trash rack fabrication. Include a detailed resume of the QC personnel.

**c. Timeliness of Performance.** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror completing past projects within the scheduled completion times.

**d. Project Management.** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's project management plan and process used on past projects. Also, Offeror shall provide a detailed Gantt chart showing ALL of the work expected on this job.

**e. Customer Satisfaction.** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's past customer satisfaction, cooperation with customers, and interaction on past projects.

## II. RATING SYSTEM

Evaluators will apply the appropriate adjective to each criterion rated for each tradeoff factor. The evaluator's narrative explanation must clearly establish that the Offeror's submittal meets the definitions established below. As

each factor is evaluated an assessment of Performance Risk will be made. Performance Risk relates to the assessment of an Offeror's present and past work and accomplishments to determine the Offeror's ability to successfully perform as required.

**RATINGS FOR TECHNICAL TRADEOFF FACTORS: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory, and \*Unknown Risk (\*Applicable only to Past Performance)**

**FOR COST OR PRICE: Price analysis will be performed to determine completeness, price reasonableness, balanced prices and the offeror's understanding of the work**

**1. EXCELLENT** - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards. The Offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timely and highest quality performance is anticipated. The Offeror possesses exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The Offeror's qualifications meet the fullest expectations of the Government. The Offeror has convincingly demonstrated that the RFP requirements have been analyzed, evaluated, and synthesized into approaches, plans, and techniques that, when implemented, should result in highly effective and efficient performance under the contract which represents very low risk to the Government. An assigned rating of "excellent" indicates that, in terms of the specific factor, the submittal contains no significant weaknesses, deficiencies or disadvantages. Offeror significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. **Very high probability of success. Very low risk to the Government.**

**2. GOOD** - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to exceed performance or capability standards. Offeror possesses one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. The areas in which the Offeror exceeds the requirements are anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency, productivity, or quality. The Offeror's qualifications are responsive with minor weaknesses, but no major weaknesses noted. An assigned rating of "Good" indicates that, in terms of the specific factor, any weaknesses noted are minor and should not seriously affect the offeror's performance. The submittal demonstrates that the requirements of the RFP are well understood and the approach will likely result in a high quality of performance which represents low risk to the Government. A rating of "Good" is used when there are no indications of exceptional features or innovations that could prove to be beneficial, or conversely, weaknesses that could diminish the quality of the effort or increase the risks of failure. Disadvantages are minimal. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. Offeror fully meets all RFP requirements and significantly exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Response exceeds a "Satisfactory" rating. **High probability of success. Low risk to the Government.**

**3. SATISFACTORY** - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to meet performance or capability standards. Offeror presents an acceptable solution and meets minimum standard requirements. Offeror possesses few or no advantages or strengths. The Offeror's proposal contains weaknesses in several areas that are offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific factor, the Offeror may satisfactorily complete the proposed tasks, but there is at least a moderate risk that it will not be successful. There is a good probability of success and that a fully acceptable level of performance will be achieved. Offeror meets all RFP requirements, presents a complete and comprehensive proposal, exemplifies an understanding of the scope and depth of the task requirements, and displays understanding of the Government's requirements. Offeror's response exceeds a "Marginal" rating. No significant advantages or disadvantages. **Moderate risk to the Government. In the case of no past performance on the part of the Offeror, a SATISFACTORY rating will be assigned for Past Performance.**

**4. MARGINAL** - Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to marginally meet performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance. The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific factor. The assignment of a rating of "Marginal" indicates that mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project. The Offeror's qualifications demonstrate an acceptable understanding of the requirements of the RFP and the approach will likely result in an adequate quality of performance, which represents a moderate level of risk to the Government. Offeror displays low probability of success, although the submittal has a reasonable chance of

becoming at least acceptable. Offeror's response exceeds an "Unsatisfactory" rating. **Significant disadvantages. High risk to the Government.**

**5. UNSATISFACTORY** – Information submitted fails to meet performance or capability standards necessary for acceptable contractor performance. The Offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be Unsatisfactory. The submittal does not meet the minimum requirements of the RFP; requirements could only be met with major changes to the submittal. There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved which represents unacceptably high risk to the Government. The Offeror's qualifications have many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; fail to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government's requirements; and, fail to meet many of the minimum requirements. The Offeror's qualifications are so unacceptable that it would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make them acceptable. **Very significant disadvantages. Unacceptably high risk to the Government.**

**6. \*\*UNKNOWN RISK** – No relevant past performance record identifiable upon which to base a meaningful performance risk prediction. A search was unable to identify any relevant past performance information for the offeror or key team members/subcontractors or their key personnel. This is neither a negative or positive assessment. **\*\*Applicable to Past Performance Only.**

### **III. Basis for Award**

1. Technical Tradeoff Evaluation Factor, Past Performance, is approximately equal to cost or price. Price will not be scored but will be a factor in establishing the competitive range prior to discussions (if held) and in making the best value determination for award. Proposals must meet the criteria stated in the RFP in order to be eligible for award, to include responsiveness, technical acceptability and responsibility.

2. The Government will award a contract to the responsible Offeror whose technical submittal and price proposal contains the combination of those criteria described in this document offering the best overall value to the Government. Best value will be determined by a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in this RFP.

3. As technical ratings and relative advantages and disadvantages become less distinct, differences in price between proposals are of increased importance in determining the most advantageous proposal. Conversely, as differences in price become less distinct, differences in scoring and relative advantages and disadvantages between proposals are of increased importance to the determination.

4. The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or highest technically rated offeror. The right is also reserved to reject any and all offers. The basis of award will be a conforming offer, the price or cost of which may or may not be the lowest. If other than the lowest offer, it must be sufficiently more advantageous than the lowest offer to justify the payment of additional amounts.

5. Offerors are reminded to include their best technical and price terms in their initial offer and not to automatically assume that they will have an opportunity to participate in discussions or be asked to submit a revised offer. The Government may make award of a conforming proposal without discussions, if deemed to be within the best interests of the Government.

### **IV. Format and Content**

Proposals shall contain, as a minimum, the information specified above in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Pages containing text shall be consecutively numbered, single-spaced, typewritten or typeset in 10-point or larger type, single sided, on 8" x 11" paper with margins of at least one inch. Pages shall be placed in loose-leaf binders/folder. Proposals shall not be permanently bound, in order to facilitate incorporation of the proposal into the final contract document.

2. It is the offerors responsibility to insure that the proposal is complete prior to submittal. The evaluation panel for the Government may evaluate solely on the information provided in the proposal and will not assume that an offeror possesses any capability unless specified in the proposal.
3. Three copies of the proposal should be submitted.

**TRANSMITTAL COVER LETTER  
TO  
PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

To: \_\_\_\_\_

We have listed your firm as a reference for work we have performed for you as listed below. Our firm has submitted a proposal under a project advertised by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District. The Corps of Engineers will evaluate of our firm's past performance in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR). Your candid response to the attached Questionnaire will assist the evaluation team in this process.

We understand that you have a busy schedule and your participation in this evaluation is greatly appreciated. Please complete the enclosed Questionnaire as thoroughly as possible. Space is provided for comments. Understand that while the responses to this Questionnaire may be released to the Offeror, FAR 15.306 (e)(4) prohibits the release of the names of the persons providing the responses. Complete confidentiality will be maintained.

Please do not return your Questionnaire to our offices. Please send your completed Questionnaire by mail, fax or email directly to the following address to arrive NOT LATER THAN JULY 18, 2005.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineer District, Charleston  
Attn: CESAC-CT (Henry Wigfall)  
69-A Hagood Avenue  
Charleston, South Carolina 29403-5107  
FAX: 843-329-2320  
OR  
Email [henry.wigfall@usace.army.mil](mailto:henry.wigfall@usace.army.mil)

If you have questions regarding the attached Questionnaire, or require assistance, please contact Henry Wigfall at 843-329-8088. Thank you for your assistance.

**PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

Upon completion of this form, please send directly to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District, Charleston CESAC-CT (Henry Wigfall) 69-A Hagood Avenue Charleston, South Carolina 29403-5107 in the enclosed addressed envelope or fax to 843-329-2320 ATTN: Henry Wigfall. Please do not return this form to our office. Thank you.

1. Contractor/Name & Address (City and State):
2. Type of Contract: Fixed Price \_\_ Cost Reimbursement \_\_ Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Title of Project/Contract Number:
4. Description of Work: (Attach additional pages as necessary)
5. Complexity of Work: High \_\_\_\_ Mid \_\_\_\_ Routine \_\_\_\_
6. Location of Work:
7. Date of Award:
8. Status: In Progress \_\_\_\_\_ (provide percent complete)  
Complete \_\_\_\_\_ (provide completion date)
9. Name, address and telephone number of Contracting Officer's Representative:

**10. SAFETY AND HEALTH:**

Evaluate the contractor's performance in complying with contract requirements, safety and health. Was overall safety demonstrated and practiced?

Excellent \_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_ Satisfactory \_\_\_\_ Marginal \_\_\_\_

Unsatisfactory or Experienced Significant Safety and Health Problems \_\_\_\_

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

**11. QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION:**

Evaluate the contractor's performance in complying with contract requirements, quality achieved and overall technical expertise demonstrated.

Excellent \_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_ Satisfactory \_\_\_\_ Marginal \_\_\_\_

Unsatisfactory or Experienced Significant Quality Problems \_\_\_\_

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

**12. TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:**

To what extent did the contractor meet the contract and/or individual task order schedules if the contract was an indefinite delivery type contract?

Completed Substantially Ahead of Schedule (Excellent) \_\_\_\_

Completed Ahead of Schedule (Good) \_\_\_\_

Completed on Schedule with Minor Delays Under Extenuating Circumstances (Satisfactory) \_\_\_\_

Completed Behind Schedule (Marginal) \_\_\_\_

Experienced Significant Delays without Justification (Unsatisfactory) \_\_\_\_

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

**13. PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

How well did the contractor manage and coordinate the overall contract, employees, and generally all aspects of the project?

Excellent \_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_ Satisfactory \_\_\_\_ Marginal \_\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

14. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:

To what extent were the end users satisfied with:

	Quality	Cost	Schedule
Exceptionally Satisfied (Excellent)			
Highly Satisfied (Good)			
Satisfied (Satisfactory)			
Somewhat Dissatisfied (Marginal)			
Highly Dissatisfied (Unsatisfactory)			

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

16. IF GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY, WOULD YOU WORK WITH THIS CONTRACTOR AGAIN?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

17. OTHER REMARKS (Attach additional pages as necessary)

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

(End of Summary of Changes)